



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES OF BOOKS.

PAUL KRETSCHEMER. *Die Griechischen Vaseninschriften ihrer Sprache nach untersucht.* 8vo, pp. viii, 251. Gütersloh, C. Bertelsmann, 1894.

The work which Meisterhans did some years ago for Attic lapidary inscriptions has now been done by Kretschmer for the corresponding field of inscriptions upon pottery. The subject is naturally of much less importance because of the narrow compass of the material at our disposal, which is confined chiefly to proper names; but a great deal of grammatical interest can be extracted from proper names, and the grammarian cannot now afford to ignore this new field so well exploited for him. Meisterhans confined himself to Attic inscriptions; the smaller compass to be treated by Kretschmer has enabled him to include all inscribed vases, and to add details that are of value to the archæologist as well as to the grammarian and epigraphist. Beyond the limit of Attic vases, the number of those inscribed is not very large. Only one is reckoned among those of the Rhodian style, the Euphorbos plate of the British Museum, which is now adjudicated from Rhodes and assigned to Argos, with the conclusion that the Camirus style had its origin from the Argive district. It is to be hoped that the excavations of our Athens School at the Heræum will ultimately solve this question. Of the so-called Cyrenæan class only one is inscribed, and to the Ionian no more than two or three can be assigned with any confidence. Of Corinthian, on the other hand, Kretschmer catalogues 45, of Chalcidian 12, Bœotian 4, Ceian (?) 1, and one of Sicyonian manufacture, with a second made in Athens but bearing a Sicyonian inscription scratched in by the owner, who was under the influence, our author thinks, of his Athenian habitat, as betrayed by the added ν of $\epsilon\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon\nu$.

In general the inscriptions used in this volume are chiefly those which were painted on by the potters before the last burning. Such as have been inscribed with a point are utilized only so far as the evidence goes to show that they have originated from the potters themselves, and not from the later possessors. The object of this exclusion is to base the results of the work purely upon the language of a single class, the potters and painters, that it may represent the speech of the people undefiled by official phraseology or literary rules. Thus our author claims that we come here into closer touch with the Athenian

workman in his blouse with his paintbrush in his hand (as we see him upon one of the vases) than even in Aristophanes or on the marbles. Kretschmer assumes that these men in general wrote as they spoke, and that the peculiarities in speech exhibited by them may be accepted as the folk-speech, although they have been usually attributed to the ignorance, the mistakes, and the carelessness of the potters. But he maintains that, where the same distinctive forms occur again and again, this reason is not sufficient, especially as they are met with in cases where the writing has been done with great care and beauty, and thus forms a part of the ornament of the vase as a whole, and they occur also at times in lapidary inscriptions: and he utters the warning that hypercriticism is as unscientific as lack of criticism, and quite as unfruitful. Hence, after obvious instances of carelessness and miswriting have been excluded, and some left to one side as admitting of doubt, our author claims that his material performs for the speech of the lower classes in Athens the service which the papyri of the Serapeum have done for the popular speech of the Ptolemaic Greeks. This differs from that of literature and official documents not so much in broad traits as in numberless little things. Here only can we learn that the common Athenian habitually said *δουλευτός*, occasionally *θητός* and *παῖς* (*παῖς*), *πίει* (*πιέ*).

It is pretty clear that the potter was but half versed in the rules of literary writing, although his social position cannot have been always a subordinate one. The wealth acquired in the art is attested by the offerings on the Acropolis, and by the immense numbers of the wares discovered in foreign countries, especially Italy. The rich Hyperbolus is an example of a potter whose language was open to comic criticism, and he was even taunted with foreign extraction. This charge cannot be brought against a very considerable part of the potters whose signatures appear on vases, as their names are either such as are known to be genuinely Attic, or bear at least no traces of a foreign stamp, as Aeschines, Andocides, etc. There are others, however, with a distinctly foreign color, as Gauris, Douris, Myspios, Oltos, etc. Phintias betrays a Sicilian or Italian origin, though he has once written his name in its proper Attic form, Philtias. Amasis indicates a knowledge of Egypt on the part of the name-giver, if not Egyptian derivation. Brygos was probably Thracian, Sikanos and Sikelos of Sicilian birth. Hence this class belonged either to the *mœtics* or to the slave population. It is not surprising, therefore, that unattic forms are occasionally met with. These are chiefly Dorian; the Ionic are almost wholly lacking on Attic vases. The former occur especially in mythic names, as *Οιδιπόδας*, and such as may be found in the lyric parts of tragedy. The Ionising tendency of tragedy may be seen in a few cases of *σσ* for *ττ*, as *Ὀλυσσεύς*, *Φερρέφασσα*, *Κίσσος*, *Κισσώ*. Here may be added the single form

τέσapa noted by Meisterhans. It appears, however, on a vase of Exekias, whose Atticism is otherwise under suspicion from his use of the unattic form Ἰόλαος. Doric endings in the names of persons, as Nikondas, are not uncommon in literary Attic. Side by side with the two cases of F in Attic inscriptions is to be ranged the form EIOLEO≤ for FIOLEO≤ on a black-figured vase of the British Museum, otherwise pure Attic.

As occasionally on the marbles, H is found for the aspirated E-sound, five times for ξ, five times for η̇ on Attic vases, and once on a Corinthian. Some cases of the Argive *lambda* (V) also occur, but they may be accidental. As compared with the lapidary forms, it is further worthy of notice that the *theta* with a point (⊙) is almost always employed, even in the first half of the sixth century, instead of the cross-bar *theta* (⊕), as is the case on coins as well. The alphabetic changes in the fifth century are also of interest to the epigraphist. The introduction of Ionic letters occasionally on the marbles in unofficial inscriptions during this period was commented upon some years ago by Koehler. Kretschmer gives a table comprising the results from forty-two vases of the red-figured style, to illustrate this feature. From this table it appears that certain Ionic letters became prevalent before others. Apart from ξ, Ξ, Ξ̄, and Υ became established first, and on no vase bearing Ionic letters do the Attic Xξ, Φξ, occur. This no doubt was dictated by convenience. Not much later Γ and Λ entered, which must naturally coincide. The vowel H comes latest, and throughout the table in no instance does it appear without E (=η), and three times with H as aspirate, never with L: while ϗ̣ is found with E (=η) several times and with L once. From the occurrence of ϗ̣ upon the roll in the hand of the pupil in that beautiful school-room scene of the Duris vase in the Berlin Museum, our author concludes that even non-Ionic literature (Æolic in this case) was at that time ("before 480") written in the Ionic alphabet, as already conjectured by Wilamowitz. The use of ϗ̣ instead of O in the transition period is regarded by Kretschmer as the result of a natural confusion, and not attributable to the Thasian-Parian mode of writing under the influence of Polygnotus, as has been often assumed; and he appeals to the marbles for support (*Mith. Athen.*, x, 363ff., 378). Before dismissing this subject, it may not be amiss to add that the spurious diphthong -ov is written several times in full in the sixth and fifth centuries on Attic vases, though only once on the marbles.

In the difficult question involved in the dating of Attic vases, Kretschmer takes advanced ground. He assigns a few inscribed examples to the seventh century, the most archaic of the black-figured type to the first half of the sixth century, and the more advanced to the latter half, thus coinciding in part with the earlier specimens of

the red-figured. This style must have not merely begun before 480 B. C., but have advanced so far in technic that a good part of its development must have preceded that date. The oldest masters united the black and red styles, as Andocides, Pamphaios, Hischylus, Epic-tetus, etc. Somewhat younger were Cachrylion, Euphronius, Oltas, Sosias, Duris, Hieron, Brygos, etc., whose cups may be placed between 500 and 480. Accordingly, the so-called "beautiful style" succeeds this period, and its inscriptions are characterized by the intermixture of Ionic letters. Vases whose alphabet is purely Ionic cannot be definitely dated, but must reach far into the fourth century.

It is in the early attribution of the "severe style" of Euphronius and his compeers, before 480, and the corresponding elevation of the succeeding style, that Kretschmer's dates go most strongly counter to the views of many. Undoubtedly it is too strict to say that, because a fragment of a vase of Hieron has been found in the "Persian Stratum," his activity was not prolonged beyond the destruction of the Acropolis; yet these dates, taken somewhat more laxly, recommend themselves from one point of view, at all events. The development of style from the archaic in vases is thus brought into better harmony with that of sculpture, and we are not compelled to ask ourselves so seriously why it was that the more facile art of painting lagged so far behind in the evolution of the fifth century. This has always been a difficulty with me, which none of the attempted explanations have satisfied.

It must be confessed that the impossibility of fixing satisfactory dates in the field of vases adds to the disadvantages of scantiness of material, when we compare this work with that of Meisterhans; yet neither of these vitiates, though they diminish, the value of the results.

Montreux, August 29th, 1894.

A. C. MERRIAM.

HEINRICH BRUNN. *Griechische Kunstgeschichte. Erstes Buch. Die Anfänge und die älteste decorative Kunst.* 8vo, pp. x, 185. Verlagsanstalt für Kunst und Wissenschaft. München, 1893.

As the last work of the venerable Brunn this little volume has a special interest. It is the first section of a general history of Greek art, a history which, if completed, will necessarily be of wide influence and importance. For whatever Brunn undertook was in his estimation worth doing well. More than twenty years ago he began this history, when the rapid succession of excavations in Greece bringing to light an abundance of new material forced him either to abandon the enterprise or to modify his plan. He adopted the latter course. No one, he declares, is yet in a position to write a complete history of Greek art. So he attempts to lay the foundation, to reach the point